

The U.S. Patent and Trademark issued an office action dated October 25, 2002. In response to this office action, applicant responds as follows:

In respect to the examiner's objection to claims 54 and 55 for reciting a dependent "method" instead of a dependent "apparatus", applicant has amended the claims to be consistent with the examiner's suggestion.

In respect to the examiner's rejection to claims 24-55, 59, and 65 under 35 USC 112, applicant has modified the pertinent independent claims in an attempt to clarify the claims in the areas suggested by the examiner.

In respect to the rejection to claims 56-58, 60-64, and 66 under 35 USC 102(b) be as being anticipated by Wirz, applicant has modified independent claim 56 to recite that the fixture is moved substantially perpendicular to a line through two points of a segment. This is different than the cited Wirz reference which utilizes an acute angle of contact.

In respect to claim 60, applicant has modified this claim to recite that the positioning fixture contacts the segment at only two points. Again, this differentiates over the examiner's Wirz reference which has an acute angle.

In respect to claim 61, applicant has modified this claim to recite that the roll is in contact with the segment. Wirz does not have a roll.

In respect to claims 62 and 63, these claims further distinguish over the Wirz reference by citing a roll with the size greater than the size of a segment. Wirz does not have a roll with this size.

In respect to claim 64, this claim recites that the rotor has main lines of action and characterized in that the two points of contact are located within the main lines of action. This is not true of the Wirz reference.

In respect to claim 66, this claim recites that there is a ring in contact with the end surface of the rotor to retain the rotor in respect to the arbor. The Wirz reference does not disclose some sort of connection between the end and tail stock (see fig 1, for example). However, one has to speculate as to how the tooth work piece is connected to these members. It is not believed that speculation is a proper basis for a rejection based on prior art.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests the examiner's reconsideration of the rejections.

Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William Lightbody
William S. Lightbody, 29,557